

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 585

EA 004 126

AUTHOR Alexander, William M.
TITLE Curriculum Planning as It Should Be.
PUB DATE 29 Oct 71
NOTE 23p.; Speech given before Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Conference. (Chicago, Illinois, October 29, 1971)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; *Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Guides; *Curriculum Planning; *Educational Improvement; Speeches; Student Centered Curriculum; Student Participation

ABSTRACT

This speech suggests some of the weaknesses in current curriculum planning and offers suggestions for its improvement. The speaker argues that current curriculum planning places too much emphasis on subject curriculum. For successful curriculum planning, the author supports these goals: (1) development of the self-directing, continuing learner; (2) active participation by the learner in planning his own curriculum in an open process that eliminates the "hidden curriculum"; (3) progression by the learner along a series of curriculum continuums, each within a curriculum domain rather than up an educational ladder; and (4) development of the school as a management center for curriculum and instruction rather than as a self-contained locus of schooling. The author describes in detail the processes of curriculum planning as they should be, emphasizing the need for cooperation among professionals, citizens, and students. (JF)

ED 061585

CURRICULUM PLANNING AS IT SHOULD BE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTION
DOCUMENTS PUBLISHED BY THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTION ARE NOT NORMALLY SIGNIFICANTLY EDITED OR REVISED BY THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION PREPARING THEM. THE POINTS OF VIEW AND OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL POSITION OR POLICY.

by

William M. Alexander

In a way it was surprising to be asked to speak on this topic--after all, the publications in the field of curriculum for some 50 years now are replete with descriptions, exhortations, prescriptions, charts, and models as to how curriculum planning should be done. Beginning with Franklin Bobbitt's 1918 The Curriculum and his activity analysis approach through many volumes on curriculum and curriculum planning, including those prepared by some of us here, there is no lack of theories as to how it ought to be done. And many of these works have either reflected or influenced practice, for most prescriptions are paralleled by at least a few related, written curriculum plans. Certainly there is no shortage of these plans; each year at the ASCD Conference we exhibit hundreds of curriculum guides, with last year's printed list of them running 106 pages. Perhaps it is the sheer mass of the formulas and guides that cause a critic as prestigious as Professor Joseph J. Schwab to have declared that "the field of curriculum is moribund." He said we had "reached this unhappy state by inveterate, unexamined, and mistaken reliance on theory."¹

Despite the weight of existing materials on the topic, as one of those who has contributed his share of the pages of both formulas and guides, I am glad to have another chance to come up with a better, hopefully more workable proposal than those which have either led us to or not deterred us from today's unhappy state of affairs. We meet here in the midst of strongly conflicting currents in American education and especially in the field of curriculum development and various auxiliary and related aspects of education.

One very great force would push curriculum planning back to all that has been previously decried and denied by most curriculum theorists and practitioners: the focus on narrowly defined objectives, whether they are called minimum essentials, behavioral objectives, or prescriptions. These foci were minutely defined through activity analysis in the 1920's and now appear again as curriculum prescriptions and performance criteria in the 1970's. They can be drilled and tested, and their execution made the basis for accounting for school expenditures.

A strongly conflicting force tending to come from the profession rather than taxpayers urges that schools become more humane. This force, appealing to most of us since to be inhumane is sinful indeed, pushes us back to the child-centered informal schools of the 1920's and 1930's in the United States and perhaps to their counterparts across the Atlantic today. Certainly, we do want to personalize curriculum options and individualize instruction in more effective ways than allowing children to progress at varying rates through uniform sequences--but it is easier to prescribe than to personalize.

- - - - -
* An address, presented at an ASCD Conference on "The School of The Future--Now," Chicago, Illinois, October 29, 1971; to be published in the Conference Proceedings by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA.

Still another force comes from the angry critics, parents, and students who would abandon public schools, letting the curriculum for each child be whatever the home, the media, the community, or perhaps the alternative form of schooling selected, would have it be. This force tends to be more negative than positive and it is indeed difficult to incorporate its proposals into a plan for improving the curriculum. Yet the criticisms of inefficiency, bureaucracy, learner abuse, and mindlessness sting, and underline the seriousness of need for far more effective curriculum planning than now generally exists.

We are faced then with the sobering knowledge that past theories and process of curriculum planning, however much some are revived in current movements and demands, have not worked either to effect education that is good enough for these times or to bring about professional unanimity as to what makes for good education. Even many professionals who have been most prolific in their publications and other efforts to bring about better planning and execution are disillusioned. In his chapter for the 1971 NSSE Yearbook on curriculum, James B. Macdonald asserted that "the development of the curriculum in the American public schools has been primarily a historical accident."² He explained this fact as a result of the complexity of the forces involved, but called for more rational input into the process of planning. In their Behind the Classroom Door, John Goodlad and his associates summarized their investigations of the first four years of school, years for which cooperative and effective planning is frequently assumed to exist, in such critical statements as this:

We endeavored to secure evidence of curriculum plans being developed by the school faculty as a whole or by committees of that faculty. We encountered only one example but, admittedly, evidence here was very difficult to obtain. Nonetheless, neither observations nor interviews with teachers and principals revealed faculties at work on curriculum problems and plans. In general, each class operated as an individual unit, taking curricular direction from textbooks, courses of study, and teachers' experience.³

Reluctantly but equally truthfully, I can add that my own observations and certain related investigations⁴ in middle and high schools during the past few years indicate a similar state of affairs in most schools above the primary level. In addition, these studies yield two observations that I believe highly pertinent to the present topic. On the negative side, one sees so very many schools in which the obsession with time for teachers to plan obscures more fundamental processes and goals of planning, frequently reducing it to a series of rapid-fire decisions on immediate problems with little effort to relate present crises and tasks to long-range goals. On the positive side, those cases, admittedly too rare, in which comprehensive planning has been done by the individual school faculty, with adequate representation from the community and student body, give much hope that careful planning at the school level can and does make a difference.

Some Basic Assumptions

Turning to the kind of curriculum planning that should be, I must perforce indicate my bias or hunch as to what has been wrong with curriculum planning in the past. My hunch is not unique; it is the same which has motivated many curriculum developments of the past--conviction that the dominance of the subject design of the curriculum must give way to more crucial and relevant aims of school and society. The turn-away-from-the-subjects efforts of the past have not been successful, and I can only hope that a new proposal to this end now finds a more fertile ground in the conflicts and dissatisfactions of today. Certainly, review of the plans made and implemented today and yesterday leaves no doubt that the dominant assumption of past curriculum planning has been the goal of subject matter mastery through a subject curriculum, almost inextricably tied to a closed school and a graded school ladder, to a marking system that rewards successful achievement of fixed content and penalizes unsuccessful achievement, to an instructional organization based on fixed classes in the subjects and a time table for them. The subject design is the very core of the establishment that today's critics would have us assess, humanize, or dismantle, depending on the critic. Many of the same critics still assume continuation of the subject curriculum, although the assessors would have us individualize its learning, and the humanists would have up open it to inquiry. Only the deschoolers might turn to other goals, although to what and how seems somewhat uncertain from their writings.

The proponents of curriculum designs built around social functions, areas of living, and similar foci, and some of the core curriculum advocates, and other theorists have for at least 50 years assailed the inadequacy of subject designs, and many curriculum plans have attempted at least briefly to implement innovative organizations of curriculum opportunities. But with the swing away from the child-centeredness of the 30's and 40's and the reinforcement of cognitive goals by the curriculum projects and the innovative learning aids and instructional organizations of the past two decades, the subjects and the closed curriculum they formed have dominated curriculum planning. In fact, the subjects were never so entrenched, for the innovations have improved their content and presentation and the commercial producers have developed a massive arsenal of supplies to teach them. I liked the recent comment by Ronald Gross on the effect of innovative programs:

The "innovative" programs were undertaken in well-established schools with fairly conventional philosophies. They were not based on new ideas about the role of education, or the nature of the child, or the place of culture in a democratic society. They focused on practical methods of achieving the traditional end of schooling--the mastery of basic skills and subject matter.

These innovative approaches changed the climate of American public education in the late fifties and early sixties. What they achieved has been important, but what they failed to achieve, unfortunately, has been even more important.⁵

Today's dissatisfaction with a curriculum geared to the subjects point to the acceptance of some different assumptions about the goals and processes of schooling. Here are four which I consider basic to successful curriculum planning:

1. The central goal of schooling, and therefore of the curriculum and its planning, is the development of the self-directing, continuing learner. Statements of this goal abound in the literature, but the hard facts of practice all but deny its existence. Actually, observers could infer very opposite goals of schooling:

One objective must be to dull the curiosity of our students, because most children leave school less curious than when they started. Another objective would be to diminish or extinguish the desire to learn, because most students enter school with a much stronger desire to learn than when they leave.⁶

Charles Silberman saw the schools as suffering from "mindlessness", and no wonder, since he viewed the purpose of education as "to educate educators--to turn out men and women who are capable of educating their families, their friends, their communities, and, most importantly, themselves" and further defines this purpose in these terms:

Of what does the capacity to educate oneself consist? It means that a person has both the desire and the capacity to learn for himself, to dig out what he needs to know, as well as the capacity to judge what is worth learning. It means, too, that one can think for himself, so that he is dependent on neither the opinions nor the facts of others, and that he uses that capacity to think about his own education, which means to think about his own nature and his place in the universe,⁷ about the meaning of life and of knowledge and of the relations between them.

In our 1965-66 survey of independent study programs we were able to identify less than 1 per cent of the secondary schools of the United States as having such programs that met our criteria relevant to independent study goals. In the ensuing years many schools have adopted new scheduling arrangements which provide independent study time, but I am not at all convinced that this time is planned for so as to influence the development of independent study interests and skills. If the central goal I am assuming were really dominant in curriculum planning, the fundamental criterion of curriculum opportunities would be their contribution to the development of increasing self-direction and independence.

2. The individual learner is actively involved in planning his own curriculum, in an open process that eliminates the "hidden curriculum". In 1957 a brochure of ASCD on "One Hundred Years of Curriculum Improvement, 1857-1957", gave us the statement that:

More recently the philosophy of democratic participation and the recognition of the dynamic nature of learning have led to emphasis upon teacher-pupil learning. For the past 20 years schools have been experimenting with ways to improve the process by which children and young people help set the goals, plan the activities and evaluate the results of their work with the leadership of the teacher.⁸

The post-Sputnik clamor for academic excellence beginning late that same year apparently put an end to this movement. In the 1971 ASCD Yearbook, James B. Macdonald writing about "The School As A Double Agent," declares:

The vast majority of schools, teachers, and other concerned persons do not trust students. The basic assumption of the schools' orientation to students is that students will do the wrong thing (what you do not want them to do) unless you make them do the right thing. If this were not so, most school policies and classroom disciplinary procedures would not be justified. Surely, faith in the worth, dignity, and integrity of individuals is not in evidence.

A high school student whose article was included in How Old Will You Be in 1984, in a similar vein asked:

Why can't we make school worthwhile enough from the standpoint of the student? Why can't we institute more relevant courses, and after very basic requirements, which even less intelligent students realize as necessary, allow students to judge for themselves what will benefit them? You can tell them what's good for them, but you can't make them like the subject. And those that do like something can take advantage of it without worrying about room for it on a schedule including non-helpful studies. Maybe we'll interest more people in school if we give them a choice--if we give them responsibility.¹⁰

My assumption says "Yes" to this student's question, a question that has played no small part in student unrest of recent years: "Yes, we can--indeed we must --allow students to judge for themselves what will benefit them." Only this assumption, and planning which enacts it, can eliminate the "hidden curriculum" of student strategies to pass the hurdles of the formal curriculum. The M.I.T. psychiatrist Benson Snyder recently gave testimony to the importance of this hidden curriculum in his book on that subject, noting:

I have found that a hidden curriculum determines, to a significant degree what becomes the basis for all participants' sense of worth and self-esteem. It is this hidden curriculum, more than the formal curriculum, that influences the adaptation of students and faculty. I know of no kindergarten, high school, or college that is without a hidden curriculum which bears on its students and faculty. Though each curriculum has characteristics that are special to the particular setting, the presence of these hidden curricula importantly affect the process of all education. The similarities in these hidden curricula are at least as important as the differences.¹¹

John Holt was dealing with the same phenomenon when he wrote:

For children, the central business of school is not learning, whatever this vague word means; it is getting these daily tasks done, or at least out of the way, with a minimum of effort and unpleasantness. Each task is an end in itself. The children don't care how they dispose of it. If they can get it out of the way by doing it, they will do it; if experience has taught them that this does not work well, they will turn to other means, illegitimate means, that ¹² wholly defeat whatever purpose the task-giver may have had in mind.

I have tended to write and speak about the "curriculum planned" and the "curriculum had." My present assumption is that curriculum planning as it should be will not longer foster or even tolerate the existence of two curriculums, the school's and the students'. The only way to end this dualism and all of the barriers to effective education involved is to bring students more openly and fully into the planning process as full-fledged partners.

3. The learner progresses along a series of curriculum continuums, each within a curriculum domain, rather than up an educational ladder. I like very much the notion of curriculum as a continuum rather than a set of subject areas and objectives. Harold Shane described a curriculum continuum as "an unbroken flow of experiences planned with and for the individual learner throughout his contacts with the school," and noted that implementation of this concept would eliminate such fixtures of present schools as failure, double promotion, special education, remedial work, annual promotion, drop-outs, compensatory education, report cards and marks.¹³ I see the curriculum continuum as a general notion to emphasize the infinite possibilities of the curriculum and to eliminate the notion of the graded, marked, standardized curriculum. For planning purposes it seems useful to think of a curriculum continuum as Shane's "Personalized Curriculum continuum", that is, as the series of learning experiences an individual has. I would further modify the notion to the series of learning experiences within a particular curriculum domain, a concept to be explained shortly.

If and as the notion of curriculum as a continuum gets accepted, the dominant question of schooling would become "what did you do?" or, even more hopefully, "what did you learn?" rather than the present "what did you get?" Anyone who reads the delightful work appropos the latter question, WAD-JA-GET? must be impressed with the massive evidence of the ineffectiveness and worse, the inappropriateness, of our dominant marking system. As the authors note; "From the elementary to the graduate level, most of the student or the teacher's life in school revolves, directly or indirectly, around the grading system."¹⁴ In my judgement, it is difficult to over-emphasize the strangle-hold of marks and all they relate to in schools. It is not enough to simply develop new marking systems, to which sooner or later old labels will revert, for we have been tinkering with marks and reports for many years to little avail. A different conception of educational purpose must prevail and with it a different set of curriculum parameters.

4. The school is a management center for curriculum and instruction rather than a self-contained locus of schooling. Bruce Joyce cited in his chapter for this year's NSSE Yearbook on curriculum our past assumptions about schools and teachers as a major factor in "the dilemma of the curriculum field:"

By focusing on a certain kind of educational institution (the school) and by focusing on functionaries (teachers) whose roles have developed within the constraints of that institution, the curriculum field has forced itself to operate within parameters so restrictive that it has been unable to develop strong, validated theory and it has been impotent to improve education.¹⁵

Like Joyce, I would not therefore argue for abandoning the school, but we can see for it very different functions in the future. Probably as Toffler predicts, advanced technology will make unnecessary the continuation of mass assembly of students in schools and change markedly the locale of education:

A good deal of education will take place in the student's own room at home or in a dorm, at hours of his own choosing. With vast libraries of data available to him via computerized information retrieval systems, with his own tapes and video units, his own language laboratory and his own electronically equipped study carrel, he will be freed, for much of the time, of the restrictions and unpleasantness that dogged him in the lockstep classroom.¹⁶

The independent, self-directed learner whose development is our goal may well be able to carry on his continued learning without the aid of school, although it can be hoped that some schools would always have resources that could be used by students of various ages. But learners do not become fully independent and self-directing in their early school years and most will probably need the help of the school at least through adolescence in arranging their learning opportunities, and in providing many which foster the development of self-direction.

Good schools have always sought to utilize the best resources available, but it is only recently that the concept of the school-without-walls has been dramatized by reports of the Parkway School in Philadelphia and other such schools making extensive use of community resources. An earlier model, the community school, brought the community into the school and served diverse functions for its citizens. Today the prevailing idea may be to take the school into the community, but what seems really needed is full recognition of the educative possibilities of many experiences in various locales and through many media. A school center to coordinate educational resources is essential. The assumption here is that the curriculum is no longer to be planned as events that occur only inside the school but instead as occurring wherever is most desirable and possible. The existence of a plan and a center for developing and implementing the plan seems all the more critical as the concept of curriculum is thus broadened.

Curriculum Domains

Traditionally curriculum components have been identified as the disciplines with passing attention only to the activities, services, and special programs. Yet, some major goals are sought if at all through the latter. The term "curriculum area" has become so identified with the subject design that I find "curriculum domain" hopefully different and more inclusive of all learning opportunities. "Domain" defined as "a field for thought, action, etc.," becomes in curriculum planning a field for thought and action relative to a single but comprehensive, major educational goal. Thus a curriculum domain encompasses all learning opportunities available to achieve such a broad goal. Materials from the disciplines are essential, but categories of the curriculum are created by goals rather than disciplines. The boundaries between domains remain very elastic because many learning opportunities including entire disciplines, may serve more than one goal. For the purpose of curriculum planning, the domains may be useful ways of designing a curriculum for the particular population served by a single school center and especially for facilitating vertical curriculum planning between school levels. Four broad goals are seen as setting the domains for most populations, although it is expected that each school district and center would determine its own domains.

Personal development. Recognizing that the entire purpose of education may be considered as aiding the development of each person, the reference here is to that considerable portion of the curriculum seeking in many ways at all levels to aid the individual in identifying and serving his personal needs and potentialities. Despite periodic debate over whether the school should serve the "whole child", few would deny that educational progress, academic and otherwise, is inextricably related to the total growth and development and well-being of the child. Communication skills seem a part of this domain as do most curriculum opportunities related to so-called "general education" objectives. Planning for personal development would also encompass guidance and other services to individual students; health and physical education; and exploratory activities that give each student many chances to discover interests for later specialization.

Human relations. American educational goals have usually included strong emphasis on citizenship education, social welfare, human rights and relationships and similar phrases encompassed here in the term "human relations." Certainly a continuous and essential goal of education in a human society, especially one which prizes democratic values and processes, is ever-improving human relations.

This domain, too, includes a plethora of curriculum possibilities: the various areas of knowledge in the social sciences and humanities; languages; social interaction and organization within the schools and other institutions of the community; the participation of students in these institutions; and specific studies and skill development activities related to particular human relations problems within the school and community such as those involved in cultural and ethnic differences and conflicts.

Continued learning skills. In practice much schooling has been preparatory to more schooling, the assumption seeming to be that the more knowledge one acquires in school the better prepared he becomes for acquiring still more at higher levels. Beyond reading and limited attention to other knowledge-acquiring skills, little emphasis has been placed on the skills through which learners will continue to learn effectively outside and after school. The dramatic lessons of ever-increasing change are clear as to the futility of expecting individuals to store up during the 12 to 16 school years enough information to solve future problems of adjustment. Instead there is now wide agreement as to the school's central mission of developing lifelong learners--individuals who are both motivated to continue learning and have the basic skills to do it.

This curriculum domain includes such standard curriculum provisions as instruction in reading, listening, viewing, and speaking. It also includes plans as yet to be generally made for teaching more advanced learning skills: interviewing, inquiry, discussing, interacting; using various information retrieval systems including those made possible by computers; analyzing issues, selecting alternatives, trying out ideas, and other problem-solving skills; evaluating sources and ideas; generalizing; and others. Especially needing emphasis in future curriculum planning are the learning skills related to group interaction and those utilizing the computer.

Specialization. The specialization domain is even more difficult to categorize than the others, for depth in either of the other domains may become specialization for an individual. But American education clearly seeks to provide an enormously wide and varied range of opportunities for individual students to work to some depth in the interests, tasks or careers which are chosen on the bases of interest and qualifications. Specialization for career purposes is generally delayed until after high school; yet many adolescents still terminate or interrupt their education before or upon finishing high school. Even younger students, in middle or perhaps elementary schools, develop strong interests, as in music, art, sports, and various knowledge areas, that can be the basis of extended instruction and independent study. Thus this domain includes such traditional school areas as those traditionally classified as prevocational or vocational, and perhaps now as career development, and in addition almost any area that can be pursued in depth by the individual selecting it for specialization. Specialization also includes such cut-across learning opportunities chosen on the basis of individual interest as work experience, community service, or extended study in another school center, community, state, or nation.

These four domains--personal development, human relations, continued learning skills, and specialization--represent a classification of major educational goals and related learning opportunities that seems fairly universal. It is not assumed that each school center would necessarily have curriculum plans within each of these domains, nor that additional domains cannot or should not be developed. The essential idea is to have a broader grouping of curriculum opportunities than in the traditional division of schooling into the disciplines and the nondisciplines. Such a broader grouping gives the basis for more functional and vertical planning and wider involvement of the persons concerned. It also should ensure the wiser selection of subjects and subject content.

The Curriculum Plan

Before describing in further detail the processes of curriculum planning as they should be, certain concepts should be reviewed. Curriculum is viewed throughout this paper as the planned program of learning opportunities to achieve broad educational goals and related specific objectives for an identifiable population served by a single school center. The planned program is arranged within categories just described as curriculum domains. The curriculum plan is an advance arrangement of learning opportunities designed to achieve a set of objectives for particular learners; usually it would be appropriately developed for a single curriculum domain, although it could be utilized for seeking several goals simultaneously. Generally it is written, but as a set of tentative agreements reached by a group of planners for achieving a set of objectives formulated for a particular group of learners. The complete plan includes in addition to its objectives, three essential elements of the curriculum system: curriculum design, curriculum implementation, and curriculum evaluation.

Curriculum planning, then, embraces the various functions involved in the choice of educational goals and curriculum domains, and within each domain the choice of objectives, curriculum designs, instructional modes, and evaluative procedures calculated to best attain the goals. Planning must properly assess the various bases from which goals are chosen; weigh the impact of external forces and variables; determine the possibilities of the internal ones of design, instruction and evaluation; review feedback from the curriculum plan during its implementation and evaluation; making changes as indicated and possible; and study evaluative data about the progress of learners on the continuums, replanning the various elements as the data indicate. The task is formidable and the most one can do in further describing it is to indicate some highlights and possibly innovative ideas hopefully meriting later discussion and exploration.

The Role of Students

About the only decision in curriculum planning which has to be made for students rather than with or by them is that of the broad goals and domains which define the scope of the curriculum. These decisions are essentially political ones determined by legislatures, boards of education, and other controlling bodies, and all the groups and forces which affect these decisions. Hopefully, input from students and adult groups representing students and data about them are powerful determinants of the decisions. But whether or not a school provides a curriculum plan in the personal development domain is not a decision in which students at the public school level usually have a direct voice. Once this goal and domain are agreed upon at some level external to the student population, students should and may have many means for affecting decisions regarding the nature of curriculum opportunities to be provided.

At least two major types of participation of learners in curriculum planning are envisioned. One type is the involvement of students of appropriate maturity in decisions about the basic curriculum plan. Certainly high school students can and do sit in on planning groups, and their contributions are prized in a growing number of high schools that are utilizing, even if belatedly, student involvement. Ways must be found to have increased participation of younger children, perhaps through parent and teacher spokesmen.

The other type of participation essential to planning in all curriculum domains and for all learners is that of the direct consultation of the learner about his own personalized curriculum continuum. For this all-important phase of curriculum planning there seems no substitute for the close relationship of a teacher-counselor and the individual learner. Despite the use of various forms of specialized teaching in elementary schools there generally remains some arrangement whereby each child has a teacher who is his particular advisor. Although too many middle schools follow the departmentalized program of the predecessor junior highs, many of them do utilize some form of home base arrangement in which each child has his own teacher-counselor. At the high school level similar arrangements are highly desirable. Galen Saylor has proposed the use of "directors of personal development" for this purpose:

In my opinion, every high school should have a corps of top-quality staff whom I would call "Directors of Personal Development." Each of these directors would be fully responsible for guiding and directing the development of a group of students--hopefully not more than 30, but, at least at the outset, considering the cost, perhaps more than that.¹⁷

The functions ascribed to these directors by Saylor include continuing diagnosis and appraisal, with appropriate professional help, of the students' talents, capabilities, and potentialities; planning of the students' educational programs; supervision of students' activities; conducting tutorial seminars; and working closely with parents, community agencies, and other staff members involved.

Thus, the role of the student in curriculum planning is most of all as a planner of his own curriculum continuum. This includes of course his participation in planning activities of the groups of which he is a member. At appropriate levels he is also a participant in decision-making relative to the total curriculum plan of the school. In my opinion no single factor in curriculum planning as it should be is more significant and more promising of fundamental change in the curriculum than the active involvement of learners in determining their own curriculums, with the fullest and wisest possible counsel of responsible adults.

Role of the School Community

Each of my four assumptions about curriculum planning as it should be point to new roles or emphases for parents and other adults in the school community. As to the first--the goal of developing self-directing, continuing learners--the closest cooperation possible is needed from parents in

assessing the self-directing potentialities and progress of their children and from community educative agencies in opening up their resources to the schools. Parent-teacher conferences will need to turn from questions about how Johnny is doing in school to how Johnny is doing at home, at the public library and museum, before the T-V set, and on family trips. Closer cooperation of school faculties, library and museum staffs, T-V programers, Scout leaders, Youth Club directors, tour conductors, churches and social welfare agencies, may mean the need for boards of community education responsible for working out arrangements for exchange of personnel between educational agencies as well as planning for schedules and facilities that ensure widespread and round-the-clock use of all curriculum opportunities within the community.

As already emphasized, the active involvement of learners in planning their own curriculum continuums should include the involvement of parents in understanding and assisting the selection of appropriate objectives and learning opportunities. For younger children this parental involvement is essential in part because of learners' immature judgement and communication abilities, but for older children it seems equally critical for the desperately needed bridging of the generation gap.

The assumption about curriculum as a continuum will never get into widespread practice without continuing interaction with parents and the public in general. Whether this is best done through continuing study groups on the purposes and processes of education, or through ad hoc groups dealing with specific problems of marking systems, and other aspects of pupil progress, or through parent groups organized around the student advisory plan, or some other means, seems a decision to be made within each school community.

The account in WAD-JA-GET? of the PTA meeting on the grading system at mythical Mapleton High School is a provocative discussion of some issues to be faced in dealing with changes in this area of vital concern to parents.¹⁸ My own bias would be toward large-scale involvement of parents and others interested in discussion of educational aims and results. The fundamental change in orientation of education from subjects to be hurdled to goals to be achieved needs all the interaction possible between school and home, and curriculum leaders need every means of communication at their disposal to bring about understanding, to consider reactions, and to formulate plans agreed upon within the school community. I would hope that continued interaction would arrive at somewhat more comprehensive plans than one for a change in the marking system, but without doubt the latter has to become a major consideration at some point.

The fourth of my assumptions, that regarding the function of the school as a management center for curriculum and instruction, in particular demands a realignment of community educational forces. Especially is there a very significant role for community people in the domains of human relations and specialization. Previous experience with community councils in these domains has been mixed as to success, but there seems no other adequate way to bring about cohesive approaches to these basic goals. Perhaps each school center

should have its community advisory council with competent specialists advising these groups on the many problems incident to opening up the curriculum to human relations problems and opening up the community to student participation in many enterprises appropriate for student learning experiences. Some of the following suggestions made with respect to the high school may have implications for schools at other levels or, especially in these days of cross-community busing, for the entire school district:

1. Establish a community council for each high school in a district that includes more than one high school.
2. Have periodic reports made to the community council by representatives of the school's student council indicating how students believe the community can help the school.
3. Similarly, have reports made periodically by representatives of the school faculty.
4. Use community media as fully and objectively as possible for reporting school programs, accomplishments, problems, and needs.
5. Promote and service student forums on community issues.
6. Provide maximum opportunities for high school students to participate in community activities.
7. Cooperate in providing meaningful work experience for as many high school students as possible.
8. Use community resource persons to give expert service in curriculum planning and instruction.
9. Open the community to students who wish to use its facilities for independent study.
10. Throughout the year, open the school, after hours, for adult education and for recreation.¹⁹

Managing and Coordinating the Planning Process

It is not within the scope of this paper to present a detailed systems approach to curriculum planning. If such an approach is really desirable, it needs to be worked out within the possibilities and limitations of each school district. Certainly it is appropriate to think of the curriculum as a system, that is as a set of components so related and organized as to attain the ends for which the system is established, and I have been presenting my thinking in these terms. Use of the systems concept offers some advantages to curriculum planners. Past efforts to plan the curriculum have tended to lose sight of the integral relationship of objectives and learning opportunities; in a systems approach the objectives are central in decision-making

activities, including those major ones relating to learning opportunities. Past efforts to plan the curriculum have also tended to be piecemeal and fragmentary; in a systems approach the planners are concerned with the total process and try to utilize all appropriate data and deal with all relevant factors as they work out the steps to be taken to achieve their goals.

But if a systems approach is interpreted to necessitate the creation of a curriculum designing unit outside the school, whether an agency of the district or one contracted with by the district, I have extreme doubt as to its efficacy. It is the individual school center in which most important curriculum decisions must be made. Using all the help possible from external sources, it is still the school faculty and students who must come to grips with the realities of what objectives are real and attainable, what experiences are possible and fruitful, what materials and equipment are useful, and what results are attained and not attained and how to modify plans accordingly. In these planning operations at the school center certain principles of management and coordination seem most significant:

1. As already emphasized, it is the student and his teacher-counselor who must make decisions regarding his progress on his own personalized curriculum continuum. Whatever prescriptions and programs are available from outside sources their choice and sequence is a highly individualized matter and even vast storerooms of prescriptions and programs may not contain the really independent study guide that must be worked out with his teacher's help by the individual interested in exploring some question hobby, issue, or task important to him.

2. The teaching team whether interdisciplinary intradisciplinary or otherwise organized should be in position to make fundamental decisions regarding the scope and sequence of learning opportunities within the particular domain for which they are responsible. Especially important are their decisions as to the instructional modes they will use and when and how: individualized self-teaching, guided independent study laboratory type experience; group discussion inquiry and analysis or combinations of these. Prior decisions, too are critical at the team level; for example, a middle school team developing a curriculum plan in the domain of human relations must choose whether to use a subject design utilizing specific studies in the social sciences and humanities or a selection of persistent human relations problems and issues, or an analysis of the essential skills of human relations to be taught as the basis of activity and skills groups or a selection with students of individual interests and problems related to human relations in the classroom school or community or others including combinations of these. The decisions as to design of curriculum opportunities and implementation through instruction ultimately anticipate the entire range of the domain for this population.

3. The school faculty and student body, sometimes independently and sometimes working through jointly representative committees and councils, have many decisions to make regarding the curriculum plan. Unfortunately, most such decisions have too frequently been made on a crisis and perfunctory basis. Processes which involve advance preparation of position papers, work of task forces, and reports of experimentation and innovation, can lift the level of faculty meetings. Student councils, too, need the stimulation of real decisions and opportunity for debate and study of the issues. The level of faculty and student decision-making can be raised by use of the curriculum domain organization of the curriculum, as feedback and proposals concerning dynamic goals replace those concerning required and elective subjects and relative time allotments. It can also be raised by the leadership of the curriculum coordinator in promoting teacher initiative and providing for teacher collaboration in curriculum change.

4. The curriculum council, as a body representing all schools, levels, and curriculum domains and serving as a clearinghouse for inter-school discussions and recommendations, remains a potent force in effective curriculum planning. Having helped to create one of the early such organizations in Battle Creek, Michigan, some 25 years ago, I am especially pleased to see its widespread use today and note with special interest its inclusion in a comprehensive treatment of a systems approach to curriculum renewal.²⁰

The significance many school districts attach to the work of these councils is illustrated by a current 9-page statement defining the organization and structure of the "Central Curriculum Committee" in the Milburn Township, New Jersey, Public Schools; a summary statement describes well the general purpose and operations of such councils:

The Central Curriculum Committee is a representative body of the elementary, junior and senior high school faculties which meets once each month to plan in-service meetings, to consider proposals for initiating curriculum projects, and to make recommendations to the Superintendent of Schools regarding significant change in the curriculum. The Central Curriculum Committee is aided in its work by commissions and sub-committees which, after intensive studies,²¹ make recommendations for action.

My experience with these organizations suggests that the council's role does need clear definition, and that it should be a major role in developing broad agreements to provide a framework for planning curriculum domains vertically for learners from school entrance to exit. It also provides for exchanging between school centers plans for experimentation, data as to projects under way and completed, and ideas for modifying goals and domains, and developing new ones. Here too is the place to assess the potential of new curriculum projects and innovations for achieving the goals and contributing to the domains of the systems. A major problem of our early councils--the somewhat lethargic interest of many teachers and more parents in the curriculum--does not seem a drawback today. With the currently almost explosive interest in curriculum development, the problem may well be to maintain an orderly agenda and to make continued progress in curriculum improvement without interruptions and lost motion from ill-considered administrative pressure and board action.

This does not seem the setting in which to discuss the relationships of school districts, the state, the federal government, and other external but potent influences on curriculum planning. I see these relationships as having two principal bearings on the process described herein. In the first place, as already stated, the external controlling bodies necessarily and actually have great influence on the setting of educational goals and curriculum domains. Hopefully the final determination is within the local school district and even the individual school center, but the influence of the external bodies and forces is certainly to be expected and tolerated or, better, capitalized upon. In the second place, these external forces also have powerful resources to assist in the curriculum planning, implementation, evaluation cycle, and the availability of these resources is one of the primary facts to be known to curriculum planners. Not only dollars, which are indeed determinants of the curriculum, but curriculum models, resource persons, coordinating and clearinghouse services, research and other reports, instructional materials, and assessment programs are available from these sources, hopefully to be used as needed rather than as enforced by fiat.

Facilitating Curriculum Planning

Curriculum planning will be as it should be only as curriculum leaders and school administrators in general secure and provide the necessary support services. I would emphasize at least six types of support that seem especially critical.

1. Staff development and collaboration. Relatively few schools and fewer school districts have enough staff members experienced and qualified in the planning processes described to put these processes into full operation. Undoubtedly the quality of planning can be effectively improved through more deliberate staff development to this end. Student-teacher planning in the personal development domain, indeed of curriculum continuums in general, may well need to be carefully monitored by other teachers, counselors, and/or curriculum coordinators to help the novice teacher become proficient in diagnosis and prescription. Team planning by teachers previously accustomed to planning for their own classes only or by beginning teachers encounters many frustrations--sometimes so difficult that any real planning purposes are abandoned, and team teaching becomes "turn" teaching. Again, monitoring and helping by experienced team leaders and curriculum coordinators and principals may be essential to getting planning off the ground. And a curriculum council doesn't share and disseminate, or lead in experimenting and innovating, by being told this is its function. Back to Battle Creek, the curriculum council was helped enormously by an elementary consultant who worked tirelessly with individual faculties and individual council members to bring about understanding of the Council's task and cooperation in getting it done. It is the communication--and I do not mean manipulation--that goes on outside and in between council meetings that illuminates issues, stimulates discussion, and brings about the real sharing and moving forward that these organizations can contribute.

Another principle to be gleaned from past experience has operated in many successful curriculum planning situations: the influence of collaboration of teachers and other staff members in innovative programs. In Battle Creek, for example, we were involved in the program of the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, and I am sure that there were no developments that moved curriculum planning forward more directly than the communication with consultants working in the several centers and the collaborative endeavors with teachers in other school districts. With all of the similar observations from the consortia of the past, such as the Eight-Year Study, the Southern Study, the Bureau of Intercultural Education, and others, and more recently the Title III centers, it is disappointing that so many school districts have continued to work in isolation, or at least for their teachers to be in isolation from those in other districts, frequently nearby ones, engrossed in the same experimentation. It is not surprising but it is confirming of these observations for the Kettering I/D/E/A League of Cooperating Schools to have found great strength in the cooperation of the professionals in the schools leagued together across district lines:

In a League-type situation, however, most of the "consultants" are teachers and principals in the schools. Thus, the innovative program is shaped by cooperation among working classroom professionals who encounter similar practical problems day after day. If successful, they can offer help. If failing, they can call for help. They know, as that much - overworked word has it, that²² the help will be "relevant" to their daily classroom experiences.

It would behoove the facilitators of curriculum planning to have their innovative staff members leagued with other teachers in other schools and even in other school districts. The isolation of an experimental group within a particular school center is inevitable as pilot approaches are used in the change process, but this isolation and the accompanying tendency to return to the norm of traditional practice can be overcome through the stimulus of association with other curriculum "pilots."

Another essential aspect of staff development for curriculum planning is that of preservice education. Admittedly many persons engaged in the education of teachers are far removed from actual curriculum planning processes of the schools, but many others do get involved. More careful definition of teams and roles within the teacher education institutions would help through utilizing the specialized skills and experiences not only of their staffs but in the involvement of local school planning processes and planners. Certainly teachers in training should have some specific training modules in individual student diagnosis, counseling, and instruction; in team planning; in planning with groups of students; and in participation in a variety of school planning groups and curriculum councils.

2. Curriculum leadership for the school center. If curriculum planning is to be as major concern of the individual school center as it should be, we can no longer evade the issue of providing curriculum leadership. I do not question the advisability of the larger district having a curriculum director

to lead in community involvement and curriculum council operation, and to provide advisement and resources for planning at the individual school center. Neither, however, do I question the absolute necessity of the individual school center having on its staff, or at least sharing with a very few other schools within the really small district, a person with definitely specialized abilities in the various processes of curriculum planning.

Most past arguments for national curriculum planning, state and interstate controls and compacts, and other external, centralizing arrangements, have justified their position by the paucity of qualified local leadership. The turn-over to industry has some of the same rationale. Endless debates of the past over whether the leader should be the principal or a curriculum coordinator, the generalist or the specialist, have really not been on target. The crucial issue is whether the educational program of the school requires that some one qualified person be responsible for enlisting the resources, facilitating the processes, and advising the participants in planning, implementing and evaluating the program. A "No" on this question is unthinkable, and it is high time that the training of qualified persons and their employment and assignment to individual school centers be accelerated. If the school district wishes to assign this responsibility to principals, then it must employ principals who have the necessary qualifications. If it is to be the curriculum coordinator, or one or more team or unit leaders, or some other position, again the problem is to identify the person with proper qualifications. The qualifications should include as a minimum training in group process, goal-setting, team planning and teaching, use of instructional resources, individual counseling, curriculum theory and research, and community relations. Undoubtedly each controlling board would add to or otherwise change these qualifications to conform to the needs of the school district. My major suggestion is that we move towards providing a curriculum leader, whatever his title, for every school center, and focus in on development of the necessary skills.

3. Incentive funds and risk capital. One of the assets of our curriculum council in Battle Creek in the late 40's was the nearness of the Kellogg Foundation and its frequent contributions of funds to assist inservice education and experimental programs. During the years since I have observed how frequently it was only the school district that had some extra funds that was able to develop a new thrust in curriculum improvement. Change was an extra and rare luxury! Title III has provided many districts with risk capital, and this has helped greatly in many places, but the most critical aid may be the relatively small grants made to individual experimenters and small units within a school center as incentive and support for a novel but promising project. The inclusion of these funds in the operating budget recognizes change as an expected and desired goal of the system. Nolan Estes carried his experience with Title III from USOE to his superintendency in Dallas in the form of a "Pennies for Innovation" fund that gives many Dallas teachers and principals the little extra needed for a new improvement effort. I read with interest a report of the Curriculum Council in Great Neck, New York, on its administration of a Research and Development fund. The 1969-70 report annotated 11 projects in process and listed 22 that had been completed, with the Council's function

described in these terms:

The Council continues to consider, for possible recommendation to the Superintendent, innovative programs proposed by Building Faculty Curriculum Groups, individuals or groups of faculty members, students, and member of the community. For the purposes of implementing such recommendations, if they are accepted, it monitors a Research and Development Fund provided for in the school budget. It ²³also receives interim reports and final evaluations of such projects.

This is an interesting illustration of the utilization of a coordinating council (in Great Neck one including representatives of administration, teaching faculty and high school student body) that actively guides curriculum improvement efforts through both clearinghouse services and special fund monitorship. Placing such responsibility for incentive funds in the hands of a major curriculum decision-making body gives it a still better chance to stimulate and guide needed changes.

4. Data for decision making. Too much of our curriculum planning in the past has relied on the opinions and experiences of the planners, with a paucity of data on which to base decisions. The curriculum council I once chaired in Battle Creek had none of the data from Title I, III, IV and other federally-sponsored research increasingly available to your councils today; neither did it have the opportunity to have immediate feedback from closed-circuit television, or to review its own actions via videotape, or to have its minutes taken by tape recording and reproduced by instant duplication! With today's resources in technology surely we can do better. The teacher-counselor helping his student to identify strengths and weaknesses and opportunities, needs not only the usual cumulative record of the student, but much information about his learning style, disability and ability, and preferences as well as the full catalogue of learning opportunities available. With computer print-outs, rapid duplication services, and instantaneous communication facilities, counseling, and the direction of personal development should be far less hit-and-miss than in previous decades. The team teachers need not only their records and recollections of the students they teach, but much data about possible resources in school and community for developing their domain. The school faculty, and the student council and interlocking councils as well can be guided in decisions by reports of experimentation within and without the school, by polls of student and parent satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and by recommendations based on data studied by its task forces and committees.

5. Student and community involvement. Throughout this discussion of curriculum planning as it should be reference has been made to involvement, both extensive and intensive, of students, parents, and other adults in the curriculum planning process. It is believed that this more than any other change in curriculum planning may be the key to improved education. Successful involvement cannot be had for the asking, and many cautions have arisen from experiences of the past few years in decentralized administration, community participation and student involvement developments. To me, these

experiences indicate that changing involvement needs to occur slowly but surely in particulars rather than as a dramatic overnight revolution. Granted that revolution may be forced upon us in some situations, and that the time is all too short and the need very great in most, it is most of all important for involvement to be successful and to be ever-widening. If as Macdonald told us in the NSSE Yearbook excerpt cited, the schools do not trust students, basic trust will not come through some overnight change in policy and organization. Small and hopefully peaceful confrontations in which mutual success is experienced and mutual confidence is developed, would seem the proper approach. At the University of Florida, a continuing action conference with representation from students, faculty, and administrators was able to identify many students concerns and take appropriate actions concerning them before the wave of unrest hit other institutions. Might such patterns of joint study be the basis for more widespread student involvement?

As to parent and community involvement, the major suggestion here is action by the administration to create small advisory councils corresponding to the curriculum domains. Whatever their title and number in a particular school community it would seem highly appropriate for representatives of the school community to be fully involved in the planning of curriculum opportunities relating to the major goals of personal development, continued learning skills, human relations, and specialization. Indeed it is very unlikely that a school center could get very far in planning effective curriculum opportunities in the human relations and specialization domains without extensive cooperation from the community, and certainly parent and community resources help is needed with the other domains.

6. Specialized services. Closely tied as curriculum planning must be to the mainstream of students and faculty, it does involve highly specialized services. In addition to the technological aid required for data processing and for information retrieval systems in general, the curriculum planning groups need much help in each step of the process. Even if the domains are set at another level, the school curriculum planning groups will need assistance in clarifying the scope of each domain and in extending their knowledge of the possible learning opportunities related to each. Specialists in each domain may need to be trained or recruited within the school district. The explication of objectives within the domain and at the level of their students' continuums also requires much help, as school districts requiring the preparation of behavioral objectives have found out. The importance of the objective-learning linkage is so great that the formulation of specific objectives cannot be left to publishers, contractors, and exchanges. Even in planning their instructional modes for implementation of the curriculum plan, teachers will continue to need help in attaining the skills prerequisite to the modes I have suggested as best alternatives for the foreseeable future: individualized self-teaching, guided independent study, laboratory type experience, group discussion, inquiry and analysis, and combinations of these.

And it is within the curriculum evaluation cycle that planners require specially expert services, for few teachers as yet have acquired the skills involved. If the curriculum leader cannot provide the necessary expertise, specialized services of a research and evaluation unit may be essential. In fact there seems much reason for such a unit to be established in most district curriculum offices. Whether this unit should be external to the curriculum organization for the purposes of independent audits seems to me an unnecessary question; granted that objectivity is desired in evaluation, its inextricable relationship to planning is also a factor to be considered. Cannot we assume sufficient professional integrity to employ our own auditors, expecting them to use defensible techniques, but also expecting the immediate and full use of feedback from the evaluations with the active collaboration of the planners and the evaluators, if these must be different persons?

Specialized services are essential, too, in the dissemination of curriculum plans and releases about them. Recently I have been examining a sampling of curriculum guides--as any of us can do by visiting the exhibit at the annual conference--and have been much impressed by the variety of materials developed within school districts and the relatively good quality of many. From one school district--Jefferson County, Kentucky--I have even received a manual on "Curriculum Writing" and it seems to me to be a very good idea for the school district to give its curriculum planners some minimum guidelines as to format and style of their written plans. Much as we may have been distressed by the specificity of earlier directions for preparing lesson plans and statements of specific objectives, and the more recent behavioral objectives binge, the importance in curriculum planning of objectives and plans does support the need for instruction as to their preparation, so long as the quality of the plan rather than the format of its presentation take priority.

Buy my suggestion regarding dissemination has most to do with the need for very specialized help in writing, illustrating, and editing materials for use by students and parents and community personnel. Schools continue to handicap their own fine aims and efforts by sending home poorly prepared statements and by giving students poor models of writing and worse communication of instructions, regulations, and plans. As the school center moves to openness and to involvement of the personnel of the community, it simply must provide specific and lucid statements about its aims, its programs, its needs, and its requests. Curriculum planning as it should be must be interpreted fully and well; probably one of the qualifications of the curriculum leader must be in the area of editing and writing, as well as other forms of communication.

From Curriculum Planning As Is to As It Should Be

Curriculum planning in our schools today ranges from being practically non-existent in far too many schools to incorporation of perhaps all I have suggested and even more in far too few. I see no shortcuts to closing this gap. What is needed most of all is a reaffirmation of faith in the learner and his teacher as the focus of planning, and in the potential of the

individual school center as the locus of its most significant phases. If we can work diligently within these beliefs to develop the requisite services, leadership, and staff development, with a much fuller involvement of students and community and a much wiser use of technology, perhaps the millenium in curriculum planning is closer than it seems. Redefinition of educational goals and curriculum domains, more critical use of objectives and learning opportunities, more feedback from trial and error, and especially more cooperative endeavor of professionals, citizens, and students, seem required. To secure these steps, would that we could call a moratorium on anger and dissension within and without the schools; since we cannot I propose that the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and every other interested professional organization and indeed every professional disseminate in every way feasible to use positive suggestions and aids for use of what we already know and what more we can discover about curriculum planning as it should be. This paper represents one small step by one ASCD-er to this end.

Footnotes

¹ Joseph J. Schwab, The Practical: A Language for Curriculum (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1970), p. 1.

² James B. Macdonald, "Curriculum Development in Relation to Social and Intellectual Systems," Ch. V in Robert M. McClure, Ed., The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect, Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971) p. 95.

³ John I. Goodlad, M. Frances Klein, and Associates, Behind the Classroom Door (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970) p. 64.

⁴ See William M. Alexander, Vynce A. Hines and Associates, Independent Study in Secondary Schools (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1967) and William M. Alexander and others, The Emergent Middle School, 2nd enl. ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969), Ch. 9 - 10.

⁵ Ronald Gross, "From Innovations to Alternatives: A Decade of Change in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 53:22 (September, 1971)

⁶ Kathryn V. Feyereisen, A. John Fiorino, and Arlene T. Nowak, Supervision and Curriculum Renewal: A Systems Approach (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 131.

⁷ Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 114.

- ⁸ Prudence Bostwick, Chairman, "One Hundred Years of Curriculum Improvement, 1857-1957," (Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1957), p. 7.
- ⁹ James B. Macdonald, "The School As a Double Agent," Ch. 13 in Vernon F. Haubrich, Chm. and Ed., Freedom, Bureaucracy, & Schooling (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1971), p. 237.
- ¹⁰ Bob Weinzimmer, "Compulsory Education--Good or Bad?", in Diane Divoky, How Old Will You Be In 1984? (New York: Avon Books, 1969), pp. 88-89
- ¹¹ Benson Snyder, The Hidden Curriculum (New York: Knopf, 1970), pp. iii-xii
- ¹² From John Holt, How Children Fail, quoted in Ronald and Beatrice Gross, Radical School Reform (New York: Simon & Shuster, Inc., 1969), p. 66.
- ¹³ Harold Shane "A Curriculum Continuum: Possible Trends in the 70's," Phi Delta Kappan, (51:389-392, March, 1970).
- ¹⁴ Howard Kirschenbaum, Rodney Napier, and Sidney B. Simon, WAD-JA-GET?: The Grading Game in American Education (New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc., 1971), p. 14.
- ¹⁵ Bruce R. Joyce, "The Curriculum Worker of the Future," Ch. XIII in The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect.
- ¹⁶ Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), p. 275.
- ¹⁷ Galen Saylor, "The High School of the Future: A Humane School," The Humanist, 31:12 (May/June, 1971). See also for further development of this proposal and description of the personal development domain, William M. Alexander, J. Galen Saylor, and Emmett L. Williams The High School: Today and Tomorrow (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1971) p. 403-409.
- ¹⁸ See Kirschenbaum, Napier, and Simon, Chapter 12.
- ¹⁹ William M. Alexander, "The Community Can Save Its High Schools from Mediocrity," The Humanist, 31:14-15 (May/June, 1971).
- ²⁰ See Feyereisen, Fiorini, and Nowak, Chapter 13.
- ²¹ "Curriculum Development Program," (Milburn, N.J.: Millburn Township Public Schools, mimeographed, undated), p. 1.
- ²² I/D/E/A Annual Report, 1970 (Dayton, Ohio: Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., An Affiliate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 1970), pp. 11-12.
- ²³ "Curriculum Development Council, Annual Report, 1969-70," (Great Neck, N.Y.: Great Neck Public Schools, September 30, 1970), p. 14.